

**COUNCIL AND PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**JOINT MEETING**  
**Monday, January 17, 2013**  
**Council Chambers**  
**6:30 p.m.**  
Minutes of Meeting

Mayor Lecklider called the meeting to order.

Present:

*Council Members:* Mayor Lecklider, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, Mr. Keenan, Mr. Gerber. (Mr. Reiner arrived late.) Mrs. Boring and Vice Mayor Salay were absent.

*Planning & Zoning Commissioners:* Mr. Taylor, Mr. Budde, Mr. Hardt, Ms. Kramb. Ms. Newell arrived late. Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Fishman were absent.

*Staff:* Ms. Grigsby, Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Foegler, Ms. Readler, Mr. Hartmann, Ms. Mumma, Mr. Hammersmith, Mr. Hahn, Ms. Cox, Ms. Willis, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Phillabaum, Mr. Goodwin, Ms. Husak, Ms. Ray.

*Consultants:* Keith Myers, Founding Principal, MKSK; Darren Meyer, Principal, MKSK; Chris Hermann, Principal, MKSK.

Ms. Grigsby stated that this meeting is a follow-up to the October 29, 2012 joint meeting discussion. At that meeting, staff updated Council and the Planning Commission on various development activities and opportunities from the last several months. Discussion occurred regarding how to proceed and how the opportunities aligned with the Bridge Street District. At that meeting, it was determined that the City would focus on the Scioto River corridor, not only because of the private opportunities but because of the opportunities for public investment and the potential impact in the area and in the District. Staff made a commitment to advance the process by assembling a team, including consultants to begin work on developing an urban design framework, look at issues related to the amount of land needed for a park, identify the necessary major public improvements within the area, determine how those improvements would impact private development and how private development may impact public improvement needs. At the November 5<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, staff reported that a consultant team had been assembled and would begin working, based on the direction given at the October 29 meeting. Tonight, the group is present to provide an update on those efforts, beginning with a description of the consultant team -- their expertise and responsibilities in this process, and the framework/goals of the process.

Mr. Foegler stated that some of the unique elements of this process involve the City's ability to simultaneously advance its thinking on a series of important public park, infrastructure and roadway improvements in these areas in tandem and hand-in-hand with those looking at opportunities for private development. A roundabout has been contemplated previously for the Riverside/161 intersection, but a roundabout engineering study does not consider the type of development a roundabout would trigger in the adjacent areas. Roadway relocations -- a series of other important public improvements -- are opportunities that must be considered from the perspective of accomplishing the kinds of private investment that could mutually reinforce those public objectives and create the desired environments. Emerging in the process are opportunities to advance that type of thinking. That is one of the important elements of the process.

Mr. Foegler emphasized the rationale, based upon the geography. There have been many graphics related to the broader Bridge Street District, bounded by I-270, SR161 and Sawmill, generally depicting strong ideas related to greenspace, development and improvement capacities within those districts. The most substantial assets of the District are the river, its strongest natural asset; and the Historic District, being the most vibrant, walkable, established environment and the historical corridor in the City. Combined with the number of potential

public improvements and the emerging number of private development opportunities in that area, Council and Planning Commission concurred with focusing the next level of analysis, planning efforts and implementation studies to guide implementation in this District. The goal from what is shared tonight is to integrate the feedback received to determine if there are areas that need additional study or if the basic framework emerging is acceptable and can be taken to the next level. That next level would be integrating more closely with some of the private development design teams and opportunities that are emerging. Integrated plans will be shared at future meetings. Major principles that are guiding some of these private design projects are the public improvements – where they should be located, their character, and what they are to accomplish. Relative issues of prioritization begin to emerge, although the team is not in a position to recommend prioritization of those, nor is it possible to estimate costs for projects that will be discussed tonight. However, it may be possible to share that level of detail at the next joint meeting. The desire is to share this information and incorporate the thinking of Council and PZC and make sure this is on the “right track.”

Mr. Foegler then shared a graphic of the area noting that it drapes the river on both the east and west, including the Historic Corridor, and includes some of the larger, vacant redevelopment opportunities and the river asset. He introduced Mr. Myers to continue the presentation.

Keith Myers, MKSK founding partner, introduced partners, Chris Hermann and Darren Meyer. Also present are Greg Comfort, EMH&T and Brian Jones of Brian Kent Jones Architects. They have also worked with a bridge designer out of San Francisco, who is not present tonight. He noted that they work in many communities, large and small, and not often does a community have an opportunity for what can be viewed as a “second time at bat.” Dublin has a great opportunity to make a great gateway into the city and build upon the success of the recently revitalized downtown area.

#### AREAS OF FOCUS

Darren Meyer shared a graphic, depicting the areas of focus for tonight’s session. He stated that one of their first tasks with all the moving parts – interest from private development, public amenities, and infrastructure improvements – was to define the most critical path – the enabling projects, priorities, and pieces that will drive the energy and momentum.

#### Pedestrian Bridge

One of the items that emerged was the concept of the pedestrian bridge across the Scioto River. The pedestrian bridge is critical for east-west movement to unlock the east side of downtown on the other side of the river. Signature pedestrian bridges are not just infrastructure items to move people from point A to B. They are part of a park, part of a larger civic picture, social spots, hubs, and areas of activity – providing many benefits in addition to critical movement. Some strategic decisions to be made are where the pedestrian bridge should land, how it can be connected to the activity, energy and heart that exist, and how pedestrian movement across it can be used to stimulate and invigorate where development is desired. From a space planning standpoint, what is the signature piece of architecture, what does it need in terms of “breathing room” when it does land, and does that influence the areas on each side of the river?

### Riverside Drive

The east side of the Scioto River has very little usable public space. From Riverside Drive to the river there are beautiful sycamores, but it is difficult to navigate. It will be necessary to create “breathing room” for the pedestrian bridge landing, and what is the implication on Riverside Drive and for the development east of Riverside Drive? Equally important to where Riverside Drive moves and shifts is what it looks like when it is completed. Riverside Drive is a parkway now, but it could be much improved.

### Park Space

This is an incredible amenity to have in the heart of the community. This land is very underused at the present time, and there is tremendous potential. Active/people space can be carved out; there are great natural features – a whole range of experiences. The key issues to explore are what function does a park serve, is a park in the core of the downtown different functionally than a neighborhood park, what are the amenities in the park, what does the community need in relationship to other parks in the community, what are the aspects to be built into this that will help finalize and drive the shape, size and configuration of the park, and as a result, what will happen with Riverside Drive?

### Intersection of Riverside Drive and 161

There have been studies done over the past several years of a roundabout design. The one driving consideration discussed by this team during the process is almost independent of the engineering solution for that intersection. There are certain traffic moving and safety criteria to be met, but one of the driving considerations is that the east side of downtown is being unlocked and there is a blank slate in terms of development on the east side of the river and this critical intersection in the community. In looking at the volume of traffic moving through this intersection and the resulting width of the pavement, how does one create a space, how to frame the development around it, how to address that intersection in a way that doesn't feel completely overwhelmed by asphalt, pavement and vehicles? That is a challenge and a topic to be advanced.

### Private Development Interest around Edges of Civic Core

As Mr. Foegler noted, an exciting aspect is the convergence of the schedule of the City and their thinking through this process and some of the interest from the market in the adjacent properties, and the rare opportunity, as Mr. Myers mentioned, to plan thoughtfully with both of those parties at the table. They are very interested in continuing those conversations.

### Tonight's goal

Their goal, both in terms of where private development is and the public uses of this – is to be clear about the trajectory of their thinking to date and to test these preliminary ideas. They want to share their collective professional opinions and hear Council and the Commission's reactions to ensure they are on target with the community's best interests. The presentation will cover the east side of the river, the west side of the river where there are some development parcels that may be moving forward with redevelopment, and some exciting, early discussions held with the library in the past several weeks.

This is an overview of the process they have been engaged in. He added that the number of pieces in play in the downtown of Dublin is amazing. In thinking of the intersection of Bridge and High Streets now, anytime one travels to a city they are not familiar with, most tourists will

be drawn to the historic and monumental core and will identify a city in this way. What exists at Bridge and High is a great kernel – authentic Historic Dublin area, with wonderful redevelopment. When this process is completed, that civic core will be expanded 100 fold. The number of adjacent areas that it touches and the influence it has on the community will be truly significant. They are very excited to be involved in this process.

#### Opportunity Areas Revisited

Mr. Meyer stated that in some previous consideration of the new circulation scheme as it is unfolding on the east side, there was discussion of the location of bridge crossings, how many, what type of traffic they will carry – vehicular or pedestrian. Over the course of the engineering work the City has gone through and some work with the consultant, there were some concerns about the impact to Historic Dublin and some of the adjacent properties with the southernmost vehicular bridge crossing. Moving forward, they have looked at the potential for a single vehicular crossing at the north, where it was previously proposed and the idea of converting the southern crossing to a pedestrian bridge. The pedestrian bridge is really a key component and provides the opportunity to define where the nucleus of activity should be on the east side. The slide shows some concepts of where the pedestrian bridge might land. The initial thought was that a pedestrian bridge could serve as a convenient edge between the Historic Dublin district and the Indian Run greenspace to the north. But the concern was with not tying into the energy and heart of that Historic District by moving the bridge up to where the Indian Run is now located. An option of tying in at North Street was considered, as it is more central to the nucleus of activity that exists in Historic Dublin on the west side. On the east side of the river, the discussion moved quickly to where Dale Drive currently terminates into Riverside Drive. Options were considered of having the bridge terminate in the park, but the sense was that the pedestrian bridge value was in linking some of the future private development and that a direct link was needed near Dale Drive. There was some consensus that the best use of the bridge -- in terms of where it lands, the private development and anchoring the east side -- would likely be at the terminus of Dale Drive connection at Riverside.

#### Council/Commission Input

Mr. Hermann asked for input regarding the bridge. What does the group think about removing one of the two future proposed bridges that had been in the framework plan and replacing the southern one – the essentially Dale Drive extension bridge – and just having a pedestrian bridge? What they have heard from the engineers is that there is not a traffic demand for these bridges, but rather, they would provide connectivity for the east and west sides. In terms of a pedestrian bridge with sweeping views, having a vehicular bridge adjacent to it would take away from the vista. He asked for input on removing the vehicular bridge and having only the pedestrian bridge, and input about where the bridge would land on the east and west sides. The consultant team believes that the North Street location to Dale Drive would be optimal.

Mr. Taylor stated that the pedestrian bridge, the roundabout, the walkability of Historic Dublin – these things are interconnected, dependent upon each other and must be looked at as one. The landing of the bridge on the park side is an easy decision, but the landing in the Historic Dublin side is much more difficult. At one point, after the Greenville visit, there was a suggestion that -- in addition to connecting downtown Dublin to a park -- perhaps another primary purpose is to connect a park that is split by the river. So the bridge is actually what links the park across the river. The traffic on 161 is the primary issue in downtown Dublin currently. Much time and money has been invested in making this a walkable district, but it

can't proceed until the issue of access from one side of 161 to the other side of 161 is resolved. Reducing the vehicle traffic load on that road and giving people another way to travel from one side of the river to the other close to downtown, without going through that intersection is something that will make the Historic District better and safer. The safety issue is what concerns him with the roundabout. He lives two miles north of the District, just north of the Brand Road roundabout, and has lived in this location for 22 years. The biggest difference with the Brand/Dublin Road roundabout is that the traffic never stops, and so there is no break in traffic allowing a driver to pull out onto Dublin Road. That is his concern in this case. If traffic never stops coming out of the roundabout, there may never be a break in traffic. Some of these things are potential solutions to enhancing walkability in the Historic District, but some may make it worse.

Mr. Reiner stated that the team has come to the crux of the matter with their recommendation of the Dale Drive connector. The middle option would only work if the library was also a pod of high activity and vibrancy. The conservative choice is the one of the far end, and that may be the appropriate one – depending upon what happens with the library site.

Mr. Hermann responded that is a great comment, and they will have future discussion with the library staff.

Mr. Reiner stated that it is uncertain whether or not the library will expand in this location or relocate. It may be another type of facility altogether in the future.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated in regard to the library that a previous visualization was that the library would still be located in the Historic area – perhaps west of its present location – and would be an educational arena. The bridge would begin from the library and extend to the other side of the river. She recalls a previous iteration with a walkway from the library and all the way across the river. The vision presented tonight is moving in the direction she had anticipated. She had not previously given any thought to the comment about the continual traffic generated by roundabouts. However, it seems that roundabout management of traffic would still be a big improvement over what exists today. The current situation that does not allow left turns from 161 to northbound Riverside is problematic and is one reason there is back-up into Historic Dublin and more danger to pedestrians.

Mr. Hermann stated that people tend to walk in a circular loop. Do we expect them to walk across the bridge and loop back on the pedestrian bridge, or in the future would there be a desire to have pedestrian traffic loop back over an improved 161 bridge? In pushing the bridge north with an Indian Run alignment, is energy created by dropping people in the north end and having them walk through Historic Dublin and around, or is that a forced march that people will not do, and the energy would therefore be lost.

Mr. Reiner stated that is dependent upon how well the scale and the development of the pod work. If it is another two or three blocks, but the development in the area is exciting -- activities, restaurants, and outdoor dining, people will want to walk that loop. He likes the idea of a circulating loop and taking people down to the 161 bridge. However, the issue is what type of development will occur and what will be the draw. Is the housing product going to include interesting shops on the lower level? For the roundabout, it is an important factor in the entire circulation pattern. It will eliminate the back-up on the bridges, allowing more pedestrian traffic on the bridge.

Mr. Keenan asked if there would be opportunity to have ingress and egress to the pedestrian bridge at another point inside the park, in addition to the terminus at Dale Drive.

Mr. Hermann responded affirmatively.

Mr. Budde asked if a pedestrian bridge would accommodate bicycles as well.

Mr. Hermann responded affirmatively. He added that the bridge design has not been done. A consideration is the landing shape of the bridge. There are opportunities for splits to various points of egress – not just a straight connection to the street and the Dale Drive intersection. These are all just concepts to be considered.

### PARK OPTIONS

Mr. Meyer stated that the screen shows some park options developed internally in October of 2011. One of the goals is to provide some better definition of the contents of the park -- features and amenities – which will drive its shape and alignment. One of the primary considerations for the park is whether or not there is vehicular access. Bringing vehicles into a park changes the character of the park – how to park the vehicles, what the parking lot looks like – particularly in terms of what facilities are in the park. For example, in the recently completed Scioto Mile where the band shell was updated, they have semi-trailers bring in shows, but can't access the park. For a café operation, there would be a need to remove trash and bring goods in. For service vehicles, how do they get in and out, how do they circulate? To compound that, Riverside Drive carries a lot of traffic and access off and on is complicated, particularly as it nears Bridge Street. The southern bypass along Riverside Drive is a piece that needs to be retained. All of those issues highlight the fact that there is no reason that vehicular access to the park cannot be designed, but it is a consideration for what is programmed in the park.

He referenced some existing riverfront parks in downtown Columbus – their functions, programs, level of success, and shape and size, including North Bank Park, just south of the Arena District at the north end of the downtown riverfront. The goal is not to try to identify how many linear feet in width the new park should be, but the key pieces that are needed. Tighter graphics have been used to look more specifically at how different park components are scaled, so some judgments can be made. North Bank Park at its widest point is 140 feet from the river edge to the road. It has been used for rental events, public events, charity events, including walks and runs; Red, White and Boom is its biggest event. They also looked at Genoa Park, a little further down the river. Genoa Park is under 200 feet wide, similar in size to North Bank. It is programmed successfully with amphitheater events, the Water/Fire event and various festivals involving the plaza in front of COSI. These two successful downtown riverfront parks that have been used as benchmarks in considering size. Looking at specific footprints for a Riverside Drive park does not mean these features have been decided -- but are for the purpose of size consideration. A couple of ideas have been considered, and in each case, they have identified some key components that are seen in signature downtown parks. There is a significant difference between a neighborhood park and a park that is in the civic core, which will have some ceremonial functions, civic functions and an image function.

#### 1. Fountains and Amphitheaters

Some key components of signature parks are fountains and a passive amphitheater, perhaps with stone seating that is integrated into the park architecture. The City already has a well received water fountain at Ballantrae. At Ballantrae, there is parking space, a restroom and

great access. The primary audience for a fountain is children, so the question is whether people would come down to the park to access it.

Mr. Hermann noted that the park graphics also depict different options for the pedestrian bridge alignment in conjunction with the different park components.

## 2. Parking

Mr. Meyer stated that they considered the option of bringing traffic into the park, minimizing it as much as possible with a right in/right out only from Riverside Drive -- a discreet parking lot with a single bay, head-in parking, and a well-integrated turnaround.

## 3. Rental Pavilion

They also looked at the possibility of an elegant rental pavilion. The North Bank Park has had great success with their pavilion, rented by lottery system; it is popular due to the downtown skyline. Dublin will have something comparable, particularly if the pedestrian bridge goes in, and the Scioto River Valley is a commanding view. A rental pavilion would also bring in revenue. On the other hand, there would be a need to think carefully about programming. When it is rented, for what purpose? Is it used for other functions, or is it closed? Also, when it is being used by a private event, it is no longer public and how is that addressed. There are pros and cons to having rental facilities in a park.

## 4. Public Art and Vending Operation

Dublin has an excellent track record with public art. He displayed footprints of parks with vending operations and public art components to scale. Given the urban audience, potential urban, mixed-use development, younger product, historic downtown, what the pieces and parts of the park may be – there may be a desire for a signature public park component. In regard to a vending operation, it is difficult to include service in and out to accommodate those. They looked at options for a multi-use, 12-15 ft. wide trail, which could accommodate small trucks.

They have presented these components for the purpose of stimulating a discussion regarding appropriate pieces for this park and the community. Those decisions will advance determinations regarding the shape and size of the park.

Mr. Reiner stated that, in his view, the river park in downtown Columbus is not successful in some ways. Dublin intends to develop high-density housing up the hill, and to OCLC on the other side of the river. The river parks in downtown Columbus are sterile spaces. In WWII in Europe, urban cores were bombed to take out the industries. Later, the Europeans had international garden shows called ECOS in these urban cores, and incorporated many amenities along the river core. The goal was to encourage people to move back into high-rise housing in the urban cores. They included parks in the urban cores with jogging trails and earth mounds – great places to walk the dog or jog. This drew people to the housing along the river. Unlike conventional American parks, they were great active spaces. At this time, the Short North and Brewery District are also being developed, so Dublin needs to execute this space in a clever and creative manner so that the young professionals will be drawn to the Dublin area to live, work in the offices and build the tax base of the City. Because the consultants working on this plan are also of that young generation, but traveled and experienced, they are well suited to identify park amenities that will have that type of draw and excitement. He serves on the Board of the Dublin Arts Council. Recently, a citizen proposed 12-foot rock climbing walls. He challenged the

Arts Council to become engaged in the project, as the climbing walls could also be sculptured to provide two or three uses, and be visually exciting from the river road, the other side or the bridge. Young people who want to live close to this kind of park could take the pedestrian bridge to access it. He is not impressed with the downtown Columbus parks, which have standard park features. Those may be nice amenities, but Dublin needs a riverfront park creating the synergy and excitement in the downtown area that will draw the young professionals to those housing units.

Mr. Taylor stated that there is a big difference between downtown Columbus and what Dublin potentially has in this location. The Scioto Mile is one-sided – all the density is on one side and all the park on the other. Urban parks work well in urban settings; both kinds of parks are necessary. This park will be the catalyst to energize the rest of the development. The City has only one opportunity to push Riverside Drive to the east, so it should be moved as far to the east as possible to avoid the park space being too small. He believes there should be vehicular access to the park. If there will be small kiosks/small restaurants, there will be a need for trash removal. Perhaps that could occur across the pedestrian bridge versus having trash trucks. Also, does a roundabout have to be round? Could it be a rectangle with an ellipse, resulting in a different kind of space than just an enlarging circle? It will be some time before there are enough residents in the high-density development to fill the park. When there are many residents, they will find ways to use the park -- whether the City programs it or not. However, he likes the idea of having a venue that allows large events to occur in this space, because that provides a bigger draw. Even a large private or charity event will draw people to the area due to increased activity and public awareness.

Ms. Kramb stated that Dublin will have three great parks within 1-1/2 miles with no connection and she believes a huge group of people are isolated by not having this connection. Much more visitation would occur if it were connected to the Dublin Arts Center, Scioto Park, the new park at Bright Road, and the new park to the north.

Mr. Meyer responded that even though they proposed a couple of traditional park ideas, that was not intended to limit the possible park choices. Although the graphic shows a limited area, there is the potential to have a connection north-south, east-west, and to the Indian Run. To him, that is all park, with various levels of activity and various intensities of potential development. That should be part of one comprehensive consideration for how it connects to adjacent parks.

Mr. Reiner stated that he agrees that there will be a need to provide access for equipment for events and food trucks, but he trusts they will disguise it with paving that appears as grass.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that it isn't necessary to accommodate everything in this park, pointing out that the existing Scioto Park is used for concerts. This is similar to Grange Audubon in Columbus, which developed piecemeal into what is now an elongated park space. Dublin should think of that linear area, which allows opportunity to integrate them and have different activities that build on one another. She likes the concept of a rental pavilion. The City already does this in Coffman Park, and therefore has experience and understanding of the private-public situation. She is not concerned about that aspect, but she would like to see a different venue. She likes a glassed-in venue, which lends itself to totally different things than does an outdoor pavilion. She concurs with Mr. Reiner that it should be possible to have a parking area that appears as grass, not cement or asphalt.



Mr. Reiner stated that in the future, the river will become a trail system, so we want people to begin accessing the river as another amenity. We have a limited amount of amenities in this location that could make life exciting. River boxes were recently added to the parks along the river to encourage people to explore this area. The intent is to make this river a more important element, so it is possible for a family to use a kayak or canoe along this area. He would like consideration given to making some point of the park accessible from the water. Because the park space is limited, it is important to also consider potential for dual usage -- for instance, sculptural features that have athletic uses that will draw young people to enjoy them and live in Dublin.

Mr. Myers stated that Mr. Reiner has issued an interesting challenge. He would argue that the elongated greenspace is not the park. The park at the river is at the center of something much larger. The park is Metro Park in scale -- very large, and includes the road. In talking about the size of the park, he agrees that Dublin has only one chance to do this, and it is important to do it right. However, Dublin has only one opportunity with the road, as well, and it is essential to be very thoughtful about the alignment of the road and the curves it will take. The road is part of the park, and people who drive it will be in that park every day. He agrees that there is an opportunity for an amazing kayak run in the park. They need to think differently. There is a tendency to go with what has worked for them in the past. He wouldn't rule those out, but they aren't the only solutions. The pavilion is a very popular element; there would be room here for two or three, perhaps one out on the bluff. The natural features of this park are very special -- the river, the limestone cliffs, the woods, the size, the scale, the pedestrian bridge -- all those elements will make this park quite different from any of the parks in downtown Columbus or anywhere else in the region.

Mr. Keenan responded that he anticipates the pedestrian bridge will become iconic. The look of that will be incredible, with its sweeping views.

Mr. Myers agreed that it will be a postcard shot. The present 161/Bridge Street bridge is attractive. The opportunity for this park is from North Street, all the way to the other side, including the road -- it is one big design opportunity.

Mayor Lecklider noted that he prefers the southernmost location for the pedestrian bridge. He is not necessarily opposed to a rental pavilion, but he wants the focus to remain on the river. At the end of this development, he is hopeful that it has not detracted from the beauty of the river, including its river bank and vegetation. Therefore, he is concerned about the placement of a pavilion -- whether it would overpower that particular area. He is also concerned about the parking it would require. If it were to be programmed as vigorously as might be expected, would it overtake the park on those occasions, when the general public would otherwise have access to it? That will be important. He would not want the general public to feel that they are not welcome whenever a reception or event is scheduled in this location. Perhaps the park is large enough to accommodate both uses.

Mr. Myers responded that one possibility is to place the rental pavilion on the downtown Dublin side. The parking that is constructed for the downtown area might support the pavilion on that side. On the east side of the river, there could be family pavilions only. It is intriguing to think about the park differently, from north to south; from one side of the river to the other.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that, in the future, people will be looking for places to gather and socialize. If they live in dense areas, as is envisioned in the district, they will not have backyards and decks to entertain their friends. It will be primarily Dublin residents who use the facilities to entertain their friends and family.

Mr. Reiner stated that he does like the glass pavilion in downtown Columbus. If that type of pavilion were placed on one side of the river, guests could park in the downtown Dublin parking area. It isn't necessary to locate all the parking into the limited area of the park. The cost of this development will be astronomical, given plans to relocate the road and buy the land.

Mr. Gerber stated that he agrees that all of the elements shouldn't be limited to one side of the river. There could be draws on the other side of the river, as well. He has heard many people comment that they enjoy driving on Riverside Drive and do not want the City to spoil that. It is reminiscent of a drive through New England, and he believes this plan will retain that feel. This park will be a gateway area for the City. He anticipates that on the other side of Riverside Drive, there will not only be residential units, but also shops, etc. that will cater to the residents and also draw people across the pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Foegler responded to the comment to move the road to the east as far as possible, noting that the drawings do not reflect the topography challenges. As the road climbs the hill and is built on an increasing amount of fill, it becomes more separated from the park, and creates challenges. The civil engineers and design team are looking at that data collectively to better understand those implications. The land is not a flat plane, as might be perceived.

Mr. Reiner stated that a very nice aspect of this design is the boulevard section – it sets the city apart. A driver traveling from downtown Columbus through Upper Arlington reaches a different road network in the Dublin area – a signature road network.

Mr. Myers responded that there was an inspiration for that. There are only a few great roads in central Ohio; one of those is Muirfield Drive through the first phase, which is boulevarded. Although there is not as much land and there are topography challenges, if a similar kind of magic could be captured, it would be advantageous.

Mr. Reiner stated that one thing that makes Muirfield Drive special is that the view created was the result of work done by several landscape architects. The road itself is a series of arcs and tangents, excellently executed, and along the road are a series of views or visual experiences. Mr. Myers noted that the alignment of the road is certainly brilliant.

Mr. Hardt stated that of the three options shown, the element that attracts him to the latter two is that they seem to cater more toward an adult population. He does not suggest that the City should have any park or amenity unfavorable to children, but the City does have 100 parks that were designed with children in mind. There is an Historic District involved that will hopefully be filled with condominiums, apartments, restaurants and drinking establishments that favor a certain demographic. He believes this park should be distinctive compared to other spaces the City has in place.

Mr. Gerber asked if they envision a tree-lined boulevard.

Mr. Myers responded affirmatively.

Mr. Meyer noted that will have the effect of pulling one into the park.

Mr. Hermann stated that the grades make this project more challenging, but also more interesting. As Riverside Drive is moved and a flat park area is created, the drive view begins to elevate or the east side of the drive becomes a wall between the development area and Riverside Drive. There is also a nice drop away to the river, and there is need to determine how to provide opportunities to experience those views from the park without taking too much away

from the vegetation. Returning to the idea of linking the parks and bike trails, the pedestrian bridge elevation will be high. It will connect Riverside Drive, with an elevated view of the entire valley, to Historic Dublin – an east-west connection. The bike trails along the Scioto River will be connecting different points. There is also the interesting idea of an additional bikepath bridge that sweeps across the river, lower in elevation, close to the water, that connects on the west bank. There could be a connection for circulation between the two. They believe it is important to provide access from the roadway on the west bank. This bank is currently on private land, but their hope is that it will become part of the public park system. They strongly believe there needs to be a public road access in that area that continues along from Bridge Street, which separates the development area from the park area and makes it feel public.

#### Roundabout/Intersection

Mr. Meyer stated that in a previous engineering study, several options were explored for a roundabout for the intersection of 161/Riverside Drive. One of those was used as a starting point from which to advance the current thinking for the framework. He presented three preliminary diagrams for the existing intersection at 161/Riverside Drive, which demonstrate what happens to some of the adjacent development parcels if Riverside Drive is realigned to accommodate a pedestrian bridge and a new riverside park, but a roundabout does not occur until some future phase. They looked at:

- (1) the projected impact of a realigned Riverside Drive tied back into the existing intersection
- (2) what the impact would be of the current thinking regarding a roundabout with the most efficient right-of-way that can be created, addressing the needs of pedestrians, vehicles and pavement
- (3) one that is closer to some of the prepared illustrations.

In regard to the last, on the surface it may appear they draw these loosely on the aerials, but the decision that goes into this is weighty in terms of impacts on adjacent development and what benefit there may be to the public. The third option could play into a future vision for this intersection. This intersection carries significant traffic. If a roundabout were implemented, the current thinking is that the lanes moving around the roundabout would need to be double lanes and maybe a triple lane through a portion of it. That would require a significant amount of land. Where there is the split, there is a lot of pavement. One of the great things about the river corridor, particularly crossing the existing Bridge Street bridge, is its scale. That is one thing that can never be recovered once it is gone. Coming into Historic Dublin from the east on Bridge Street, and needing to pull some of the scale of the river into that intersection, it is important to balance the amount of pavement with some greenspace so that it does not feel “jammed in” and taken over by cars and pavement. It will be asphalt, concrete and vehicles. How can an atmosphere be created that allows pedestrians and bikes to move around this in a way that is comfortable and better links areas of activity? The distance from west of Dale Drive to where it ties into Historic Dublin is fairly long through that roundabout -- it is a large intersection. Bridge Street has a sidewalk on the north side, but it is not a comfortable walk; it is somewhat narrow. They are studying the relative benefits of creating more comfortable pedestrian movement; how to achieve scale and space for that intersection that offsets the amount of traffic; and what is the impact on adjacent development. None of the diagrams shown present a preferred option or internal consensus; they do show the variables they are exploring through this process.

Mr. Myers added that the proposed roundabout predates their involvement in this process. It has been referred to as "the mother of all roundabouts" – and it is that. He feels compelled to state that he is terribly conflicted about it, because it is such a large, powerful stamp to place at the entrance to a village. This will be an extremely large roundabout. He recalled again the simple elegance of the Muirfield Drive Boulevard. His concern is that a roundabout is too heavy-handed as the entrance to a bridge, over a river, and into the village. Perhaps consideration should be given to 161 being a boulevard. We would have the Riverside Boulevard with the attractive slip ramp that runs underneath in this location. He recognizes that the traffic is significant, but from a purely urban design standpoint, this roundabout feels really large. Roundabouts are not pedestrian friendly; they are used by 2,000 pound vehicles that never stop. He is not claiming that one solution is better than another, but he is pointing out that their team is very conflicted about it.

Mr. Gerber stated that previous discussions have focused on the desire to make Bridge Street more walkable. The goal is to divert traffic away from that intersection. If some other ideas that have been discussed, such as the OCLC plan, occur and that road is extended to connect to Dublin Road, would that take some pressure off this intersection – in conjunction with the bridge at Tuller Road? He recognizes that this roundabout would be massive. Although Dublin residents have adjusted to the addition of roundabouts within the community, this roundabout would compete with the overall goal to make this a walkable area. How does one have three lanes of traffic stop for pedestrians to traverse it?

Mr. Foegler responded that the engineers believe the traffic volume there will increase over time. Although there are benefits to keeping that traffic localized and not spilling out on the arterials, given the regional function of this roadway, it is still projected to experience an increase in traffic volume over time. In the modeling that has been done, in all scenarios, significant diversion does not provide relief in this location.

Mr. Taylor asked if the solution must be a roundabout. There is a roundabout between Southern Pines and Pinehurst that is the size of the sidewalk that is depicted on the screen tonight. It is not the typical, engineered roundabout. It is actually a circular road with roads leading in and out of it. The one at Southern Pines has a copse of trees in the center, and one cannot see the other side of it – it is that large. Could a circular road be considered versus a roundabout with little, isolated islands of difficult-to-maintain grass -- a totally impassable and isolated centerpiece that requires passing through three lanes of non-stop traffic to reach? Is it possible to look at this in a different way?

Mr. Foegler responded that discussion would be needed with Engineering. Part of the challenge with this intersection was trying to keep it as compact as possible to minimize the impacts. The consultants are considering it in the context of the development taking place around it. Before proceeding, they will certainly ask Engineering to make sure that a variety of solutions have been considered. From a capacity perspective, with the number of movements and number of left turns that are desired at this location, and given the relative impacts for a traditional intersection at this intersection, a roundabout is far less impactful in all scenarios and the only solution that can accommodate all the turning movements. However, they will make sure that the design team and civil engineers who have worked with staff previously will continue to look at other options for mitigating the traffic impact, and also at ways in which the negatives can be

minimized and made as positive a part of the gateway feature as possible – should a roundabout be implemented.

Mr. Hermann stated that they discussed possibilities for pushing it a little closer or making it larger, but the closer it is moved to the 161 bridge, the more likely the bridge would have to be replaced. Engineering is hoping to avoid that necessity. Engineering staff indicated that incorporating a larger radius for automobiles would require a bridge replacement.

Mr. Hardt requested a size comparison of the proposed roundabout with existing Dublin roundabouts. Is it comparable to the one at Muirfield Drive, twice the size, or other? Ms. Willis responded that it would be comparable in diameter to the roundabout at Muirfield and Brand Roads.

Mr. Keenan asked if that roundabout was designed to add a third lane of traffic in the future. Mr. Hammersmith responded that it was not; it was constrained to two lanes. The closest comparison in size is the roundabout at 161 and Industrial Parkway. Staff can forward information on the projected size dimensions. Although it will be a very large roundabout, this is a large intersection with a high traffic volume with conflicting movements. Even if it were signalized, it would be a large signal. They are attempting to balance traffic mitigation with something that blends with everything else the City is trying to accomplish. Mr. Myers responded that he concedes that point.

Mr. Hermann stated that if the pedestrian bridge is landed at Dale Drive, it is necessary to create sufficient, level landing room in front of Riverside Drive, to enable that space to be active. That does mean Riverside Drive must be pushed further to the east than previously contemplated. That may impact the decision regarding Dale Drive.

Mr. Taylor noted that they have the engineering view of the solution, but are missing the design perspective.

Mr. Myers said they would be happy to provide that information.

Mr. Meyer stated that private development interests exist for the east and west sides of this area. He requested Mr. Foegler to provide initial comments.

Mr. Foegler stated that discussions have occurred with the owners of 94 N. High Street. Information about the City's process permits that developer to make meaningful development decisions. Recently, Crawford Hoying has completed a purchase agreement on the Vrable property and is engaging in a similar, cooperative effort. Having significant private developments moving forward in their design process and informing the City's considerations for this area will be very beneficial. The City is trying to identify the keys to strategic redevelopment sites, which become more real when there are real developers supporting the general vision. In the next 30-60 days, there should be more information to share.

Mr. Meyer displayed a slide depicting four areas: existing City property; existing public open space owned by others; potential open space acquisitions or dedications; and key potential development/redevelopment sites. These are the areas in play or, in varying degrees, have some interest from the private development market, and they are beginning to engage in those discussions.

Mr. Myers stated that having the opportunity to re-think the Bridge Pointe site is remarkable. The downtown area, even if nothing further is done, is good; however, the gateway into the City is not. And now the City has the opportunity to change that – what he has referred to as a “second chance at bat,” which does not happen very often.

Mr. Meyer stated that the character from Historic Dublin to the river and Riverside Drive -- the character of the development already there and what it could be as the plan is advanced -- sets the tone for the entire eastern side of downtown. What really influences it are amenities such as the park and the pedestrian bridge. In the past, parks have been geographically distributed to provide equal population access, but they are also economic drivers. When they are well designed and well maintained, they affect real estate value positively. They are a key tool in the City’s toolbox, not to provide only a public amenity but also to spur private development.

Mr. Hermann stated that the redevelopment on the corner, for which there is an interested developer, will give the City the opportunity to affect this edge of Riverside Drive and establish the architecture and density. That will then signal to the market what the City expects to occur between Sawmill Road and Riverside Drive.

Mr. Meyer stated that on the west side of the river, there are a few opportunities that are further along in development, including the current concept for North Riverview.

Mr. Foegler stated that Crawford Hoying has ownership of 94 North High; 100 North High remains under separate ownership. They have been looking at planning opportunities for multiple sites there, but the one for 94 North High is very real.

Mr. Meyer stated that the key element with these sites is that they extend to the river. The park is not shown on both sides of the river, because that carries assumptions that have not been finalized in regard to the status of those parcels and moving forward with the vision of a park on the west side of the river. They are pleased that there is a developer who is engaged in the vision and will help the City achieve it.

Mr. Gerber asked what type of development is proposed for 94 and 100 N. High.

Mr. Meyer responded that it would be a mixed use that is aligned with the character of Historic Dublin. There are challenges with grade on the site, which drops 30-40 feet from High Street to the river, specifically a need to accommodate the difference between the river level and the street level in a way that is scaled appropriately. Crawford Hoying is collaborating closely with the team in exploring a number of options. Although there are benefits that come with the extra height, the question is how to handle that visually.

Mr. Hermann added that the good news is that there is a market for this type of development. The trade-off is achieving the necessary density with an appropriate view for the east. If the densities work, the developer will be able to provide the desired parkland along the west bank of the Scioto. They are attempting to integrate a public parking structure into the area across the street from the library, which would provide parking to serve their units, as well as provide significant numbers of parking spaces for Historic Dublin.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked about the timing for the development.

Mr. Foegler responded that they do not yet have a plan that is workable. There are certain thresholds that must be met when a large building is being removed for redevelopment. The fate of the building to the north will factor into this plan, as well, and the necessity to resolve

the public parking details. It is a complicated site with difficult issues to resolve, but they will move forward as soon as the pieces come together, there is consensus and there is a deal that makes sense for both parties.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked if those issues are resolved, could the project begin in 2013, or is it more likely to be 2014 or 2015?

Mr. Foegler responded that given the easement issues, floodplain issues and other challenges, the developer would proceed as quickly as they were able to obtain permits and design approval. In addition to the many challenges, a parking structure is very expensive. It will require significant design feedback to try to make it as efficient and inviting to the public as possible. There have been questions from staff regarding whether this is the piece of the District that really needs a large parking structure. The answer to that is that it depends upon the other plans the City has for the area around it, which could determine whether it is located on the far edge versus inclusion with a potential Library site redevelopment. The developers are anxious to move forward as quickly as possible.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked about the status of Mr. Bird's site development plans.

Mr. McDaniel responded that Mr. Bird recently received ARB approval to tear the houses down. That was a significant obstacle. He continues to discuss investment opportunities with various parties.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that Mr. Bird had included public parking in one of his earlier designs. The public parking dilemma needs be resolved soon. It may be time to "bite the bullet" and get it done. Pedestrian traffic is the plan for this area, so people will no longer be so concerned where their car is parked. The previous tendency was to park near an intended point of destination. The holistic plan for this District will change that behavior.

Mr. Foegler stated that it is important to note that design, planning, development, financial and partnership discussions have moved more quickly on this project than anyone involved with a project like this, including its design team, has ever seen. A timeframe cannot yet be projected -- not for lack of all the parties' efforts, but because the plan must make sense for the City and the developer, given all the constraints. He can provide assurance that everyone is putting their best faith and efforts into trying to advance this as quickly as possible.

Mr. Gerber stated that there certainly is a need for more parking in that area, but the City also wants to encourage people to walk. His thought was always that the parking facility should be on the east side of High Street. There are too many unknowns with respect to the west side -- the library, the school, etc. Building a parking facility in that area may result in the City losing out on other development opportunities. He believes the current proposal may be the appropriate place for a parking facility.

Mr. Keenan stated that the topography on the east side lends itself to being more cost effective for building such a structure versus the other side of High Street.

Mr. Foegler stated that from an urban design perspective, it would be preferable not to have a high structure protruding. The challenge is from the other side, the perspective from the river and this great park that is being planned. When we previously viewed a drawing of an eight-story structure -- a long, linear pattern framing the park on the eastern end, concerns were raised about integrating some of these other urban design objectives with it. All those issues are achievable, but they need to work for all the parties involved. They are putting forth their best efforts to achieve a workable plan.

Mr. Keenan stated that there may be more political will to consider a private-public partnership, if it will achieve the number of parking spaces needed.

Mr. Foegler noted that it would be a great private project, where it is essentially screened in the process – the best of both worlds. The feedback tonight is good, as it helps everyone involved in the project be aware of the City's priorities and goals.

Mr. Keenan asked if there was any further discussion regarding a potential City Hall. There was discussion about re-visiting the issue at the next CIP discussion.

Mr. Foegler responded that the civic facility under discussion is the Library. The consulting team would like to hear if there is some level of consensus that they should also explore where and how other public use facilities/spaces might be integrated into this area.

Mr. Meyer stated that they have met with the Columbus Metropolitan Library staff, and the Library has briefly shared their thoughts regarding the future of the Dublin branch, either in Historic Dublin or at other sites. There are some internal decisions the Library is considering with respect to what a more urban, mixed-use, higher density structure in Historic Dublin would mean for the function of a library. Their responsibility to the taxpayers is to determine if they can support that urban model, which may have multiple stories and structured parking, or if it needs to be a different model in a different location. There is interest in a potential site on the river. They discussed a vision of a two-story glass reading room and fireplace looking out over the river. Mr. Foegler has made them aware that a site on the river may not be indefinitely available, however. The 94 North High site is in process with the development team, but it is necessary to keep the Library informed sufficiently to enable the decision-making process on their end to be in line with the decision-making process on the City's end, so that opportunities are not lost either way.

Mr. Gerber responded that he believed that the new facility would be more than a library -- a 21<sup>st</sup> century learning center that would include a library but also classrooms for colleges in town for additional learning, or music/art classes. The inference is that the City would contribute to such a project, but he was envisioning a much larger facility to accommodate more than a library.

Mr. Foegler stated that the Library has inquired about the status of those last discussions, and the team has responded that those options are on the table from the City's perspective. The thinking has not been refined beyond the ideas that Council has discussed. The first question the Library wants to discuss, however -- the urban nature of its location -- is important with regard to the explorations the team is currently conducting. That doesn't preclude the possibility of considering more substantial square footage being devoted to it for other purposes.

Mr. Taylor stated Mr. Gerber referred to a civic center that would have functions in addition to a library. There are other functions in this building that overlap with the functions of a library. If the programming for that building goes much beyond a library, then there are outdoor spaces that could be included in the programming. To him, the need is for a more urban setting than a one-sided setting on the river.

Mr. Foegler asked for feedback about whether Council wants the team to explore opportunities for other kinds of municipal office and civic space as part of this effort.

Mr. Taylor noted that he believes Vice Mayor Salay has been in favor of identifying a location for a performing arts center in the City.



Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she would not be in favor of duplicating what the school district already has. The schools, City and community need to use their current facilities to their fullest potential. She asked Mr. Foegler to clarify his comment that the Library is thinking about whether they want to be an urban library or something else.

Mr. Foegler responded that in looking at something integrated into the urban character, it would be multi-story, and that is not the Library's typical suburban model. That also means structured parking, which has implications for the operational aspects of the library. They are receptive to having those internal discussions, but it would be a significant change from their suburban model. They are having those discussions in good alignment with the timing of the City's plans, to determine if those ideas make sense to them before exploring options for a more urban site. In most cases, that would be multi-story, would not include a typical parking lot, and could be mixed-use. They find some elements of that exciting and consistent with where their future is headed, but because it is a very different model, they want to make sure it works for them.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that two or three years ago, the Library was represented at Council's goal-setting session. They showed pictures of other libraries throughout the country, and that was what interested Council in something other than the suburban model – a mixed-use, interactive community use. She does not envision municipal offices included, but instead would envision spaces for activities that are community-driven. It could include spaces for some type of partnership efforts for higher education, but not at the expense of delaying this facility for several years to achieve it.

Mr. Foegler stated that the Library has been extremely interested in advancing their exploration of this idea. He clarified that he had not meant to suggest that a City Hall be integrated with a Library. He meant that if there are other civic functions, buildings, or uses to be included in the overall planning effort for this geography, the team would want to know.

Mr. Gerber asked if the delay with the Library is due to the lack of a decision about the site, or if other factors are involved.

Mr. Foegler responded that he believes that the Library has been waiting for direction from the City with regard to a preferred location for it. Early in the Bridge Street Corridor planning, the team had indicated that they would include an exploration of opportunities for a Library site. This summer, Library representatives indicated that, given their funding ability and the relative priority of the Dublin branch, they were very interested in advancing those discussions. The team has initiated that as an important element of this planning effort to see if a site possibility emerges that is a good fit for both the Library and the City.

Mayor Lecklider stated that one of the initial questions is whether the highest and best use for the land along the river is a library. He assumes if that is the collective decision, it will be the more expensive option; therefore, the Library will look for a greater contribution from the City.

Mr. Foegler clarified that the squares on the diagram reflect buildings on top of a parking pedestal; one on an edge that may have retail on the first floor and frontage. They are symbolic only. They would likely be on top of a mixed-use development and part of a much broader series of uses in this location. The economics would have to work for everyone. Tonight, they are not asking for a preference for one or the other. A question they posed to the developer is

if this kind of use can be integrated into the mixed-use environment. They have shown some concepts, and their design team has provided feedback that shows ways that could happen. What they have done with the Library is indicate that these are two of what will be more possibilities and opportunities. They were shown to stimulate their thinking, because this project will probably move quickly if this proves to be a real opportunity. They will be providing updates regarding additional investigations related to library sites. They wanted to demonstrate tonight how they are partnering with private developers and exploring opportunities as they emerge.

Mr. Hermann stated that if the parking structure is placed in the ravine behind the 94-100 North High Street buildings, there would be hundreds of parking spaces. The developers were hoping that there would be City participation in providing public parking within the parking structure. Because it did not seem right to provide only public parking in a private development with all private uses, they looked at how to integrate a public use into this large development that would justify it -- linking the public spaces to a public use. Obviously, it would also be great for the retail uses in the area. In addition, the idea of a new, modern library on top of the parking garage, with views out over the Scioto valley, is very exciting. Its presence in this development could help justify City investment in the public parking. Another key part is that the present library site would be available for redevelopment and road connections.

Mr. Gerber stated that he is not necessarily opposed to the new library in this location, but he had always envisioned it further west, perhaps more in the middle near OCLC. A library in that location would overlook the Indian Run and have that scenic view, and it would be more central to all residents, as well.

Mayor Lecklider stated that the ideal location is certainly somewhere in this great District, but it is important to be mindful of what the public will support. This is a public facility supported by levies, etc., and the public has been more conservative with support for these operations.

Mr. Foegler stated that, given Council's priority for this improvement, as these discussions with the Library advance and some of these or other opportunities need to move to the next level, they will schedule another discussion with Council and other stakeholders regarding this.

Mr. Hermann stated that they have compiled all of their current thinking to date in one plan, but this is a work in progress. Using tonight's feedback, over the next 4-6 weeks, they will be working with private development teams with interest in this, will continue discussions with the Library and move many of these graphics into 3D to provide a richer discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Foegler stated that they recognize they cannot finalize every question around each of these public improvements. Some of the projects will be further along than others. However, when the process is completed, a much higher level of clarity will be added to some of the larger components, such as Riverside Drive, the general feel of the park, locations for pedestrian crossings, and advance discussions regarding the roundabout. It will also provide as much guidance as possible for private developers about these key redevelopment or new development sites, so that the City's expectations can be clearly articulated. A series of things will not only come together with clarity, but also will be ready to take to the next level. The results will be a provision of good guidance to both public and private decision-makers for

implementation purposes. Some of the prioritization will relate in part to opportunities – such as structured parking, but other items will be longer term. There is a desire to gain a sense of the timing, but that is yet unknown. They anticipate that the timing of some of the early stage projects will be much clearer by the end of this process. They are accomplishing what they hoped in regard to (1) solicitation of private developer interest; and (2) proposition, planning and designing to make the development that occurs as good as possible.

Mr. Reiner asked if any thought has been given to the stacking of the units up the hill in regard to their views.

Mr. Foegler responded that the most recent developer has just finalized site control in the last two weeks. One of the challenges is that, as the City finalizes the location of Riverside Drive and the roads that intersect from the east coming down the hill, the impact of the grades and topography on those building sites will have to be closely evaluated. It will create some extraordinary opportunities, as well as other elements. For the first time, there is now a developer and design team totally engaged with the City to address those issues. This will help the City determine the rest of the roadway network and help them understand how those elements tier, how to deal with slope and elevation, and their impact on density, access and some of the other key objectives.

Mayor Lecklider thanked the consultants for their presentation, noting that this has been a productive discussion. Council looks forward to continued progress.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

---

Clerk of Council